A

VINDICATION

OF THE

ADDRESS

TO THE

PEOPLE OF GREAT-BRITAIN,

ON THE USE OF

WEST INDIA PRODUCE.

WITH SOME

OBSERVATIONS AND FACTS RELATIVE TO THE SITUATION OF SLAVES.

IN ANSWER TO

A FEMALE APOLOGIST FOR SLAVERY.

THE SECOND EDITION,

WITH STRICTURES ON HER REPLY TO A REPLY,

By RICHARD HILLIER.

SUGAR, it has been said, would be dear, if not worked by Blacks in the Western Islands; * * * but let Sugar be as dear as it may, it is better to eat none; to eat Honey if Sweetness only be palatable; better to eat Aloes or Coloquintida than violate a primary Law of Nature, impressed on every Heart not imbruted by Avarice, or rob one human Creature of those eternal Rights of which no Law upon Earth can justly deprive him.

Sir Wm. Jones's Speech to the Freeholders of Middlesex.

LONDON:

SOLD BY M. GURNEY, NO. 128, HOLBORN, L. WAYLAND, MIDDLE-ROW, AND T. KNOTT, NO. 47, LOMBARD-STREET.

[Price Two-Pence.]

XH
.71D
.H55V6

A

LETTER, &c.

MADAM,

A FEW days ago, your pamphlet was put into my hands. Having rejected the produce of the Weſt Indian ſugar cane ever ſince parliament thought proper to turn a deaf ear to the ſupplications of the nation, in behalf of the injured Africans *, I rejoiced to find that the propriety of purchaſing commodities, obtained by a ſyſtematic courſe of legal oppreſſion, was in a fair way of being inveſtigated; but I little thought that, in a nation tenacious of its liberty, which had given birth to a Macauley, a Barbauld, and a Williams, I ever ſhould have found a female apologiſt for ſlavery †. Had not ſome general idea of the deceitfulneſs of the heart put me upon my guard, I could not have imagined that the holy ſcriptures would have been quoted in ſupport of villainy and fraud. People are ſometimes the unwilling inſtruments of accelerating general good: you may have the pleaſure of reflecting hereafter, that

* The Female Apologiſt aſks, "But why not abſtain from its uſe long before?—Was your conſcience aſleep till that ſpirit of revenge, which breathes in both your pamphlets, rouſed it from its torpor?" I have not the honour of being the author of the well-timed, and ſpirited Addreſs, to the People of Great Britain; but my conſcience was certainly aſleep, as far as relates to its contents, till I ſaw it in manuſcript.

† The lady ſays, "I neither wrote in defence of, nor in oppoſition to, the ſlave trade, but thought it a queſtion involved in ſo many difficulties that it required a wiſer head than mine properly to diſcuſs." Some recent diſcovery of inherent wiſdom has induced her to diſcard an opinion ſo much beneath the truth. She is now able to give a clear, hiſtorical vindication of that commerce, ſupported by ſuch "facts as no one can diſprove." See page 10 of her Reply.

the diſcuſſion you promoted was fatal to your cauſe. In order to ſecure the attainment of ſo deſirable an end, I ſhall diſcuſs the doctrines you have laid down, as conciſely as I am able. Should I, in the courſe of argument, treat them or their author, with too little reſpect, my excuſe will be, that when writing againſt cruelty it is natural for me to forget, that I am writing to a woman *. At your firſt off-ſet, you take care to inform us, "That you are not ſo devoid of the feelings of humanity, or Chriſtian principles, as to wiſh ſlavery and oppreſſion to any individual of the human race." It was kind in you to tell the world of your humanity and your Chriſtianity; as, without ſome ſuch friendly hint, no exertion of human ſagacity could have diſcovered that you poſſeſſed any thing like the humanity of the eighteenth century, or the Chriſtianity of the New Teſtament. But if you are *really* an enemy to ſlavery, why do you plead in its defence? You are at ſome pains to inform us of its great antiquity. You tell us that it was regularly carried on when Jacob's ſons ſold their brother. We believe it was before that time. We believe,

"Proud Nimrod firſt the bloody chace began:
"A mighty hunter, and his prey was man!"

But if the antiquity of ſlavery ſtamp it with dignity, how honourable is murder! for, in the days of our firſt parents, Cain roſe up againſt Abel, his brother, and ſlew him. As to what was tolerated among the Jews, it is not of ſufficient importance to our preſent queſtion to merit much attention; as, if it proves any thing, it proves, that as they were permitted to enſlave all nations, the claim of us poor Engliſhmen to liberty, is contrary to the revealed will of heaven. Your huſband ſhould alſo be informed that polygamy is very ancient, that it was univerſal at the time the law was given

* This my fair antagoniſt allows I might innocently do, but at the ſame time wittily obſerves, "that the large quantity of acrimony contained in my *portion* informs the world that either myſelf, or the party whoſe cauſe I have the honour to eſpouſe, felt ourſelves ſtung by a woman." True we did ſo, but though from the buz, which apprized us of the approach of ſomething venemous, we were induced to expect a waſp, yet we are now convinced that what we felt was only a temporary tingle, occaſioned by the acetous depoſit of an induſtrious inſect, whoſe unremitting vigilance prompted her to embrace a favourable opportunity of dragging a barley corn to her cell.

to

to Iſrael, that it was in uſe among the Jews, and that, like ſlavery, it continues among that people in various parts of the world to this day. Should the reduction of your theory to practice, produce any family uneaſineſs, you are not ignorant, that Moſes ſuffered his diſciples, to write bills of divorcement, and to put away their wives.

The Romans, you inform us, "with all their boaſted liberty, practiſed ſlavery." And it is alſo certain, that, with all their boaſted knowledge, they practiſed the moſt ſtupid idolatry. Theſe facts only prove that ignorance of liberty, and ignorance of piety, go hand in hand. Having eſtabliſhed the antiquity of ſlavery, you exultingly exclaim, "A cuſtom thus ancient—thus univerſal—is it not more a matter of ſurpriſe, that it ſhould ſo long have ſubſided in ſo many parts of the world, than that it ſtill continues the ſcourge of Africa?" No: rather let the heavens wonder, and the earth be aſtoniſhed, that, while we are ſurrounded with ſo many inſtances where the name of Chriſt has reached the ear, we find ſo few where his religion has reached the heart; and that there ſhould ſtill exiſt men, who, while they pretend to love their neighbour as themſelves, yet ſtrain every nerve to detain him in perpetual bondage. This, *we are required to believe*, is not your caſe; you only reprobate the doctrine of the addreſs, as "propoſing means inadequate to its end. And recommending a real evil on the vague ſuppoſition that good may come." Whether the means propoſed by the author of the addreſs, are adequate to their end or not, remains to be proved. And, with reſpect to the evil he recommends, we ought to have been informed, whether it is a natural or moral evil. As it breathes nothing but univerſal good-will to men, and contains no avowed ſentiment inimical to Deity, if any evil is propoſed it muſt be a natural evil: and we are juſtified in doing that, in order to ſecure a greater good. If not, why did you marry, and expoſe yourſelf to the probability of dying in child-birth? Or why do people in general ſubmit to the amputation of a diſeaſed limb? Are not the riſk of death and amputation in themſelves evils?

We are next told, that, "The author's calculation of the number of murders muſt certainly be exaggerated, as by the late regulation of the number in proportion to the ſhip's tonnage, and the appointment of ſurgeons, muſt

needs prevent a great deal of the evils he mentions." Now would it not have been a little more modeſt juſt to have pointed out where a man's calculations were wrong, than to aſſert, "They muſt certainly be exaggerated, merely *becauſe* they muſt? And ſhould not you, who ſhudder at the thought of paſſing by a ſugar-plum as a real evil, have given us an exact ſtatement of the ratio of murder we might commit, without tranſgreſſing the limits of your curious humanity? Has your benevolent parliament regulated the quantity of bad weather the ſhips are to meet with on the middle paſſage? Have the ſapient ſkulls of legiſlators deviſed a mode by which they can prevent a ſhip from ſinking, when ſhe ſprings a leak? Are your ſurgeons of Guineamen ſuch very clever fellows, above all the profeſſion, that they can cure grief, and fear, and the effects of a foul atmoſphere? If you cannot anſwer theſe queſtions in the affirmative, tell us by what diſpenſation from a God of mercy, you conſign juſt men and innocent children to a floating hell; or elſe relinquiſh your impious claim to Chriſtianity. You inform us that, "It can be no more the intereſt of a planter to ſtarve or murder his ſlave, than it is of a farmer to kill his horſe." This ſtale argument à priori muſt be conſidered by thoſe who have been in the Weſt-Indies, or who have read the evidence before parliament, as a piece of impertinence not worth anſwering. But, if you will come before the public a ſecond time, and attempt to prove that farmers never abuſe their horſes, never entruſt them to their ſervants, never kill them when worn out; and, moreover, that a horſe and an African are animals ſo nearly alike, that we have as much right to enſlave the one as to ſaddle the other, then I will reaſon with you upon your own grounds *.

There may poſſibly be a few perſons in London who die in conſequence of oppreſſion, or who are murdered. But to

* To this objection againſt her brutal compariſon, the lady makes no anſwer. A melancholy inſtance of the poor ſecurity which the intereſt of a maſter affords to the exiſtance of a ſlave now challenges the public attention. There is in St Thomas's Hoſpital a lad of the Mocoa nation, who was recently brought from his native country. His tyrant thought proper to ſend him to England; for what purpoſe it is not neceſſary to enquire. The captain to whom he was entruſted, ſuffered him, at this inclement ſeaſon of the year, to lie on board a cold ſhip in the Thames without hammock and without fire, the conſequence of which is, that both his legs are mortified, and it is doubted whether he will ſurvive their amputation.

ſay,

ſay, that the number of injured ghoſts who plant thorns on the pillows of their oppreſſors, amounts to threefourths of the robuſt young men who come from the country for employ, is to talk madly. The bare aſſertion of ſuch nonſenſe, unſupported by evidence, indicates a mind either deſperately weak, or deſperately wicked. You affirm that the pamphlet proves too much, conſequently proves nothing; and, in confirmation of your poſition, you alledge, "That the goſpel was propagated by the blood of its firſt votaries, the proteſtant religion by the ſame means. Muſt we therefore, deſpiſe Chriſtianity, renounce proteſtantiſm?" In order to derive any advantage from this left-handed logic, it is neceſſary you ſhould prove, that the propagators of the goſpel themſelves violated the rights and liberties of one ſet of men, in order to obtain an article called the goſpel, to ſell for their own emolument to another. You ought farther to ſtate that though this goſpel was highly grateful to the receiver, it was what might be diſpenſed with without injury; and that, by a continual purchaſe of this goſpel, you were continually creating freſh crimes, and continually rewarding the criminals. Had you ſtated the matter thus clearly, to the way-faring man, though a fool, your goſpel would have appeared ſo odious, that if his heart was not harder than adamant, I am perſuaded he would have rejected it.

With reſpect to our conſumption of other luxuries procured by ſlavery, we may perhaps be reprehenſible; but ſurely our minds have not arrived at that perfection of depravity, which emboldens men in the commiſſion of one crime, from a conſciouſneſs that they daily commit half a dozen*. By the bye, it is quite a miſtake, that all the produce of the Eaſt-Indies, and that all the gold and ſilver we

* The auguments of the friends of Slavery are all founded upon this principle. Thus the punishments in the army are produced in vindication of Weſt India floggings, the illegal cruelty of maſters to their apprentices, in ſupport of the tortures, authorized by the brutal ſanction of the Weſt Indian code of laws——the oppreſſion, that under the beſt government, may be occaſionally exerciſed upon the labouring poor, in defence of abſolute ſlavery—and the purchaſe of one commodity procured by oppreſſion, in defence of the purchaſe of another. While the moraliſt deplores the "proſligacy of the human mind" the friends of freedom muſt rejoice to ſee that no body oppoſes their exertions, but thoſe who are ſo radically vicious as to reſort to one crime for the defence of a greater.

uſe, is the production of ſlaves. And although it has been faſhionable to abuſe the ſervants of the Eaſt-India Company, it will be recorded by hiſtory, that there once exiſted a parliament which exhibited Articles of Impeachment againſt an individual for peculation and cruelty, and yet made laws for the continuation of kidnapping, and ſet a price upon the heads of victims then unborn. You ſtrive hard to confound free, with compulſive labour; and to betray the people of this country into an opinion, that ſlavery and toil are ſynonymous terms. The reaſon is obvious, the people of England are inured to labour, and do not conſider it an hardſhip; but they are accuſtomed to receive the reward of that labour; nor can they brook the idea of one man toiling at the deſcretion, and for the advantage of another *. When once the people of England have ſeen the nakedneſs of ſlavery, thoſe who now burn incenſe on her altars, will ſoon ſing *requiems* to her ſoul.

Britiſh miners in particular, will not thank you for calling them under-ground ſlaves; nor for drawing a compariſon between them and Africans, But, as you ſay their ſituation "ſeems unenviable even to a Weſt-India ſlave," I can recommend an experiment which will furniſh you with the the moſt authentic intelligence on that head. The ladies in the Weſt-Indies have a happy dexterity in ſlipping off their ſhoes, and beating the heels of them about the heads of their negroes. Now, with a very little practice upon your bed-poſt or dreſſing table, you will make a tolerable proficiency in the art. If ever afterwards you have an opportunity of viſiting Newcaſtle or Kingſwood, put your experiment in practice upon the head of the firſt collier you meet, and depend upon it, you will ſoon arrive at an abſolute certainty about the comparative happineſs of a free miner and a ſlave.

It is worthy of remark, that the mode you have adopted of ſupporting your cauſe, by mutilated portions of ſcripture, is the very ſame artifice which the devil made uſe of when he tempted Jeſus Chriſt to commit ſuicide. Strange,

* She ſtill perſiſts in the aſſertion, that the difference is more in words than in facts. What *peerleſs modeſty for a lady* to confront a cloud of witneſſes, on a ſubject which ſhe does not pretend to know any thing about from ocular demonſtration!

that

that the wiſdom of the ſerpent ſhould ſuit your purpoſe better than the innocence of the dove. But, there is nothing new under the ſun; the agency of ſimilar cauſes will always be exerted to produce ſimilar effects. As long as error is ſupported, ſcripture muſt be perverted. As it does not ſignify what the conquering Iſraelites were allowed to do in the devoted land of Canaan, I ſhall leave you, "naturally to ſuppoſe" what you pleaſe, and to be as wiſe above what is written as you pleaſe, where our queſtion is not concerned, while I proceed to examine that counſel which you have darkened by words, or rather by ſtripping it of thoſe words with which it was connected. Our Lord, you ſay, declared that nothing which went into a man could defile a man. And pray who ever ſaid it could? Certainly not the perſon to whoſe addreſs you have written what you call an anſwer. He never ſaid that ſaccharine matter of any kind, whether eaten with unwaſhen hands or not, was capable of communicating that defilement which the tradition of the elders making the commandment of God of none effect, had conjured up. He never entered upon the queſtion to my knowledge. Therefore how any part of that controverſy can apply to his argument, is as much above my comprehenſion, as the curious piece of intelligence with which you immediately follow it up, is too extenſive an article for my little faith, viz. "That *every thing* which went into the body at that time was *altogether* prepared by ſlaves." As this is not one of the things which you "*naturally ſuppoſe*," but which you roundly aſſert, ought you not to give the world an opportunity of deriving their knowledge from the ſame unſullied current of hiſtory by which it is tranſmitted to you? Can you inform us who were the owners of Martha and her ſiſter Mary? who were the owners of the apoſtolic fiſhermen? and why they permitted them to wander about with ſuch an unpopular character as Jeſus Chriſt, without once ſending the jumper after them, or ſetting a price upon their heads, as your friends in the Weſt Indies often do? When the world is ſatisfied about theſe particulars, perhaps the ſociety of antiquarians may elect you a member of their order, or the Creolean literati give you a name, and a place in the Mythology of

tropical divinity *. But ſhould it appear that your information is only the ipſa dixit of a vain woman, you have no reaſon to feel hurt, if your word ſhould ceaſe to be regarded, or be regarded only with ſuſpicion.

The next portion of ſcripture, which you wreſt to ſuit your own purpoſe, is of the ſame nature with the firſt. Our Lord, being at dinner with a Phariſee, his hoſt "marvelled" that he did not perform the cuſtomary ablution. On this occaſion he received the following ſharp reproof: "Now do ye Phariſees make clean the outſide of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedneſs. Ye fools! did not he that made that which is without, make that which is within alſo? But rather give alms of ſuch things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you." Your making the precept general, without preſuppoſing the thing poſſeſſed equitably obtained, would make ſociety unbearable. Men might make fortunes by rapine and ſlaughter, then give alms of ſuch things as they had; *and, according to your expoſition*, all would be clean unto them; for Jeſus ſaid ſo in direct and general terms. The apoſtles, you ſay, give ſimilar directions, "Only to let our moderation be known, and that every thing is ſanctified by the word of God and prayer." Oh! the adroitneſs with which you manufacture a text! You are as expert in ſplicing the fagg ends of different epiſtles together, as in paring the rough edges from a portion of ſcripture, which you tear from its connexion. The apoſtle, indeed, recommends moderation in general terms; but from the mere circumſtance of his ſo ſpeaking, it is impoſſible he ſhould have in view any particular action of life, the propriety of which was doubted. With reſpect to the latter clauſe of your queſtion, it relates to thoſe abuſes which would come to paſs in the latter days, through the influence of thoſe who would depart from the faith, and forbid marriage, and the uſe of meats, not becauſe they were diſhoneſtly obtained, but ſimply on their own account. Now, in this point of view, nothing is to be refuſed; but every

* But as the ſecond publication of the lady is no more explicit on this head than her firſt, ſhe muſt be content to ſip the nectar of Weſt India hills, and feaſt on the granulated ambroſia of the cane, till fate ſhall crown her reſearches into antiquity with more ſucceſs.

thing

thing is ſanctified by the word of God and prayer. "Meat commendeth us not to God!" Pray, who ever ſaid it did? "*Therefore*,"—Not quite ſo faſt with your "*Therefore*." The world muſt be informed that you are ſtriding over nearly three chapters, and that your friend, "*Therefore*," by whoſe aid you fill up the chaſm, is a creature of your own formation. The text reads thus: "Whatever is ſold in the ſhambles, that eat, aſking no queſtions, for conſcience-ſake. For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulneſs thereof. If any of them that believe not, bid you to a feaſt, and ye be diſpoſed to go, whatſoever is ſet before you, eat, aſking no queſtion for conſcience-ſake. But if any man ſay unto you, this is offered in ſacrifice unto idols, eat not, for his ſake that ſhewed it, and for conſcience-ſake: for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulneſs thereof." Now, by attending to the ſenſe of the author, we ſee that the diſpute in queſtion was about meat offered to idols, and not about the propriety of purchaſing goods fraudulently or violently obtained. Your expoſition affects the moral character both of Chriſt and his apoſtles; as it repreſents them appointing receptacles for ſtolen goods, and encouraging the diſciples to devour any man's property, provided it was expoſed for ſale in the public market, even though they were aware that the perſon with whom they dealt was an habitual thief, and the property they purchaſed moſt commonly ſtolen *. You reſt ſatisfied in the idea, that you have diſproved what nobody attempt-

* This horrid perverſion of holy writ is rendered ſtill more impious by the futile attempt which the author makes to extricate herſelf from the imputation of wreſting the ſcriptures to ſuit her own purpoſe, by involving in the ſame guilt the Son of God and his great Apoſtle: The latter, ſays ſhe, quotes the Law of Moſes, when urging the church to maintain its miniſters; and the former ſuppreſſed the latter clauſe of the ſentence by which he reſiſted the temptation of the devil. The apoſtle, by way of illuſtrating his meaning, quotes a part of the Law of Moſes; from which in one part of his writings he draws an inference, by arguing from the leſs to the greater, and in another part he leaves the inference to the underſtanding of his reader. Our Lord alſo quoted only a part of a ſentence from the Old Teſtament; but that part contained all the precept that the original meant to convey. Neither of theſe great characters ſo quoted the Writings of Moſes as to make him ſay what was quite foreign to his meaning, in order to derive authority form a practice which had an evil tendency: but thus ſhe has done by them both.

ed to eſtabliſh: that "Abſtinence from the ſugar cane is no part of a Chriſtian's duty."

The author of the addreſs never ſaid it was. He only urges it as a duty, "To abſtain from the uſe of the ſugar-cane *till we can have it unconnected with ſlavery, and unpolluted with blood.*" Our abſtinence, you ſay, will do no good, "The iſlands will declare their independence, and find a vent for their goods in ſome other market." But to ſhew the world that you have not undertaken to give lectures upon a commerce of which you were entirely ignorant, be ſo kind, next time you write, as to inform us, how the produce of our iſlands is to find a vent in foreign markets. Already we pay ſo large a bounty to force it abroad, that were half as much refined ſugar exported as there is raw imported, nearly the whole of the revenue derived from that article would ceaſe. And when we conſider, that the bounty is not a new thing, and that even by its aſſiſtance our planters were not able to re-export any large quantity of their imported goods, before the diſturbances in the French iſlands—when we recollect that America will ſoon ſupply herſelf with ſugar from the maple tree *, that the Eaſt India Company will in a great meaſure ſupply the German market; that Spain, Portugal, Holland, and Denmark, have ſugar colonies of their own; that the ſugar of Sierra Leona will be driven abroad by an unnatural alien duty; and when we call to mind, that England is almoſt the only country where rum is uſed, we would fain know in what ſequeſtered corner of the globe the Weſt Indian is to find a market for the fruits of his oppreſſion, when the diſturbances in the French iſlands ſhall ceaſe, or when Parliament ſhall ceaſe to reward his iniquity from the public treaſury? Is he to barter them for cat-ſkins at Nootka Sound? or will the Greenlander receive them in exchange for blubber?

"But ſugar (you continue) is ſtyled a luxury; and the covetous man will readily adopt the language, becauſe, by denying his family an expenſive article, he can make a

* "They muſt wait till the trees grow, ſays my opponent." A recent American publication informs us, that there are trees enough, in Pennſylvania and New York, to ſupply the whole United States. In Virginia they are ſtill more numerous; ſome of them have been tapped annually for theſe twenty years.

ſure

ſure ſaving." Such paltry ſlander is as innocent as its author is contemptible. In the ſubſequent ſentence, indeed, you acquit us of the crime of avarice, by allowing, that although we refuſe the Weſt India ſugar, we purchaſe that from the Eaſt at an exorbitant price. But the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel. We are reſcued from the whip to be chaſtiſed with ſcorpions. We are accuſed of ſtraining at gnats, while we ſwallow camels. What is the import of the accuſation, I neither know myſelf, nor have I been able to find any one who could inform me. As there can be no crime in receiving the produce of free labour *, ſuch as Eaſt India ſugar, you muſt certainly mean, that the people who reject the produce of robbery and murder, indulge themſelves in the commiſſion of crimes of deeper dye without remorſe. If this is your meaning, either point out your man, and point out his crimes, or elſe repent you of the ſin of bearing falſe witneſs againſt your neighbour. You inform us, that "No large commercial country, no grand monarchical form of government, ever was, or ever will be, ſupported without luxuries." Whether they were or not, I ſhall not contend, as our queſtion is not, whether we ought to live luxurioufly or frugally; but, whether we be juſtified in tranſporting men in chains from one country, to be tortured for the gratification of our appetites in another? Should this queſtion be anſwered in the negative, I aſk, why you tempt another to do what you would not do yourſelf? Why you join a crowd, to do what you would not do alone? Why you reward iniquity by purchaſing an article procured by the perpetual acceſſion of freſh crimes? You anſwer, "God has left us free—debarring ourſelves from the Weſt-Indian cane is will-worſhip, and, like every other inſtance of voluntary humility, has a tendency to defile the conſcience, and darken the underſtanding." If the voluntary humility, the worſhipping of angels, and the apparent wiſdom in the will-worſhip of human tradition, againſt which the Coloſſians were warned, have a tendency to defile the conſcience, and darken the under-

* The Marquis Beccaria obſerves, that tyrants never read. It ſeems their advocates are equally indolent. For had the Female Apologiſt read the evidence of Mr. Botham, it is probable ſhe never would have aſked, "What are the free men who cultivate ſugar in the Eaſt Indies?"

ſtanding,

ſtanding, ſurely the apparent folly and voluntary arrogance with which you pervert the ſacred writings, betray ſtrong ſymptoms of a conſcience already defiled, an underſtanding already darkened. With reſpect to diviſions among Chriſtians, they are certainly diſagreeable, when they occur; but they muſt not be averted, by ſacrificing the repoſe of conſcience. However, you foretel, that he that eateth not, will judge him that eateth, &c. It is ſtrange, that all through the argument you cannot help talking about *eating!* Like the miſer's cook of Moliere, the only words in your mouth are, *eat, eat, eat,* although your queſtion has no more reference to eating, than it has to riding on horſeback; but relates ſimply to the propriety or impropriety of *receiving* goods improperly obtained. If the ſtaple commodity of the Weſt Indies had been apparel, inſtead of food, what ſcripture would you have perverted then? As the caſe is, may we not hope for a text or two in vindication of the uſe of rum? Would not our Lord's ſacramental invitation, "Drink ye all of it," and the apoſtolic declaration, "the ſpirit giveth life," when properly tacked together, after your mode, be admirably explicit?

As to the ruin of trade, and the train of dreadful conſequences, that is to follow our abſtinence, that is nothing to us. If the produce of the labour of ſlaves is not equitable property, it is our duty to refuſe it; and our acceptance of it is criminal: or elſe, why are men puniſhed for receiving ſtolen goods? Before you called your book An Anſwer to the Addreſs, you ſhould have diſproved the poſition, That, "*As the planter has no right to the perſon of the "ſlave, he can have no right to his labour, or to the produce "of it**." Had you done that, the controverſy would have

* The Female Apologiſt contends that the lawful captive and the ſtolen being indiſcriminately mixt, and an equal price being ſet upon both, the merchant makes a legal purchaſe; and that the planter has a right to his ſlave, conſequently to his labour. By pleading for the right of the planter to the perſon of his ſlave, ſhe at once admits, what cannot be diſproved, viz. that the right to purchaſe the produce of ſlavery is derived from the prior right of ſlavery itſelf. But before we admit either, may we not hope that our wholeſale dealers in the blood of men, or their female amanuenſis, will tell us how a ſet of innocent men, women, and children can become the lawful captives of a few intereſted traders? The nature of African wars and African captures will be better underſtood by attend-

nave been nearly decided *, unleſs we are to do "a real "evil on the vague ſuppoſition that good may come." As to the ſtate of freedom in which you urge God has left us, if it is the liberty of doing actions which tend to the enſlaving of others, it looks more like the bondage of iniquity, than the glorious liberty of the children of God.

In your libel on the army you affirm, that "a ſoldier is deprived of all the benefit of the laws of his country — that he is an abſolute ſlave,—that he is ſold by the wretch who firſt betrays him,—and that if ever he attempts to emancipate himſelf (that is, to deſert), he is ſhot like a mad dog." In ſhort, you conclude your *ſublime climax* by ſaying, that forcing an hundred young men into the army, "might be as bad as being the remote cauſe of enſlaving an hundred Africans." That the pay of the army is much too ſmall, and its puniſhments much too ſevere, cannot be denied. *But that a ſoldier is deprived of all the benefit of the laws of his country, is one of the groſſeſt falſehoods that ever diſgraced the Preſs. The records of the Old Bailey lamentably prove, that he is allowed trial by jury. And the records of Weſtminſter-hall are not devoid of inſtances, to ſhew that a ſoldier may inſtitute a civil action, even againſt his officer* ||. As you tell us, ſoldiers "are abſolute ſlaves, and are often ſold §," can you not inform us where the ſales are kept? I ſhould imagine they muſt be by *very* private contract, as I never heard of a lot of grenadiers being knocked down by

attending to the evidence given on the ſubject before the Houſe of Commons, than by liſtening to the imaginary intelligence of "Old *wives* fables."

* The controverſy *is* indeed decided with this lady, as it entirely hinges on the poſition above ſtated, "that the planter has *no* right to the perſon of his ſlave."

|| I am told in reply to this, that "to mention *the hanging of a man* among the number of his benefits would have been too groſs an inſult on the feelings and underſtanding of my readers." I ſhould have thought ſo too, had not the various defences of ſlavery convinced me that its adherents are as infamous for weak heads, as for wicked hearts. But to prove that an Engliſh ſoldier *cannot be hanged* without the deciſion of a jury, is certainly proving that he is not "deprived of all the benefits of the laws of his country."

What a candid reaſoner this lady is!

§ This is affirmed with a reiteration, "Yes, Sir, the blood of ſoldiers *are* ſold," for *worſe than nought*.

Chriſtie,

Chriſtie, or any other gentleman of the hammer. With reſpect to their being ſhot like mad dogs, for deſertion, I think you would find it difficult to produce half a dozen inſtances in point, for the laſt twenty years. As this horrid picture of the Britiſh army is ſhewn by way of extenuation of colonial tyranny, I ſhall draw ſuch a compariſon between them as I am able to do from my own knowledge and obſervation. The ſoldier, before he is ſuch, hears where his regiment lies, and the name of his commander; knows the pay, and thinks he can live upon it. He is offered a bounty, and accepts it. He is allowed four days for reflection; if he repents his engagement, he pays twenty ſhillings, returns the money he has received, and is diſcharged. But if he likes the ſervice, he goes before a magiſtrate, ſwears he was fairly enliſted, that he has received his bounty, that he is a proteſtant, that he has heard the articles of war read, and that he will be a good ſoldier. If he is ſent to the Weſt Indies (where we muſt certainly ſend him, for the ſake of compariſon), he is firſt clothed, and provided with bedding; he has full liberty on board the ſhip which tranſports him; and when he arrives at his deſtined ſtation, he is lodged in dry and comfortable barracks; he is well fed, well clad, and his pay continued, not unfrequently with an addition to it from the iſland. He has very little to do, except the morning exerciſe; and if he is employed as a mechanic, he receives extra wages. He cannot be puniſhed, but for a crime expreſſed in the articles of war; and when puniſhed, by the ſentence of a court-martial, a ſurgeon attends, who may remit ſuch part of the puniſhment as he thinks him unable to bear without injury to his conſtitution. He may even bring his general to a court-martial, and the evidence of his peers is admitted. When ſuperannuated or diſabled, he receives a penſion, which, if inſufficient for his ſupport, he may reſign to the officers of his pariſh, and they muſt maintain him.

Would God this were the caſe with the wretched African. A ſad reverſe, alas! is fact. Before he was a ſlave, he tilled his little patch of ground, planted it with yams, or ſowed it with rice; and felt a reward within his ſimple breaſt, from a conſciouſneſs that he was providing for his little family, who contributed their tiny pittance to the honey of the hive, by ſcaring the feathered plunderers from the ripening

ing crop. A few hours daily labour ſupplied his every want; the remainder was devoted to hoſpitality, and merriment, and joy. He welcomed his friends with the eaſy politeneſs of nature, ſeated them on the turf, and was almoſt inſtantly at the ſummit of the ſtately palm-tree that waved its majeſtic leaves contiguous to his hut. Thence quick deſcending, laden with delicious wine, he filled the callabaſh of each contented gueſt, whoſe ſupple limbs, obedient to his rude *banjay* *, began the athletic dance, while the animated chorus of unaffected voices inſpired a chearfulneſs of which the formal ſons of European feſtivity can form no adequate conception. But, ah! ſenators have no bowels of compaſſion. The happineſs of Africans muſt be ſacrificed at the ſhrine of their avaricious policy. They have legalized murder. They have aſcertained the quantum of miſery it is expedient to inflict. They have dared to ſet a price upon the heads of innocents, who never did them an injury, who never ſought a connection with them, who never even heard of their country, or their colour. Corrupted by their gold, and ſanctioned by their authority, the ſons of violence are on their way. Their emiſſaries are ſitting in the lurking places of the villages, and lying in wait ſecretly to catch the poor. They catch our African. A yoke is put upon his neck, and he is goaded to the ſhips. The price of his blood being agreed upon, he is ſhackled to another victim of European cruelty, and thruſt under deck. The recollection of his country and his friends drives him to deſpair. He cannot think why he is torn from them, why the wretches who have laden him with chains, are deſirous that he ſhould eat; he cannot account for their brutal kindneſs; he concludes they mean to fatten him, in order to feaſt upon him at a convenient ſeaſon. He reſolves to circumvent their deſigns; he refuſes food: he is whipt to make him eat; but the indignant firmneſs of his mind is not to be ſubdued by the laſh. The *ſpeculum oris* § is reſorted to; a broken tooth gives an opportunity for its introduction; his mouth is

* An inſtrument ſomewhat like a guittar. Its uſe is prohibited in ſome parts of the Weſt Indies. Perhaps from an idea that it is ſuperfluous in thoſe lands of *ſuperior felicity*.

§ An inſtrument with which they force open the mouths of ſuch ſlaves as refuſe to eat.

forced

forced open, rice is crammed down his throat, and he is compelled to live. He arrives at the Weſt-Indies, and is ſold. He now depends upon the will of an individual for his all. He is now in a country where all nature conſpires againſt him, where babes are taught to liſp, "that the worſt white is better than the beſt black." He has now no legal protection againſt his maſter. He is even under the abſolute controul of an hireling, who has no intereſt in his life. His maſter's name may be branded in his fleſh with hot irons, and all the while he may be allowed the character of a good ſlave. But ſhould he bend reluctantly to his fate, the horrid cart-whip would make long furrows in his fleſh; his lacerated body would be waſhed with brine or ſea-water; he might even be tortured with melted wax, or boiling ſyrup; and any white man might kill him with impunity, as the united teſtimony of a thouſand of his peers would not be conſidered as evidence by a Weſt-India court of *in*juſtice. When ſuperannuated, he may be deſerted by the wretch who has waſted the vigour of his youth; and when periſhing with hunger, he may be inſulted, by being told that he is free *.

After all your boaſted chriſtianity, you at laſt unmaſk, and tell us, Charity *ſhould* begin at home." *Your* charity, my good lady, may *begin* at home, and *end* at home, *and ſtay at home* for ever. The world will be no loſer. But genuine charity prompts its poſſeſſor to embrace ten thouſand worlds, then melts him into tears, becauſe he can graſp no more.

You ſeriouſly caution us againſt "affecting too much pity for ſtrangers, and being too clamorous againſt Weſt-India avarice, cruelty, and oppreſſion," merely becauſe we have abuſes at home. That we have abuſes at home, nobody will deny. But, that either the author of the Addreſs, or any of his proſelytes, "applaud or approve the enſlaving of tens of thouſands of our brethren, merely on the doctrine of neceſſity," is an exploſion of that arrogance which you palm upon the world inſtead of argument. That we ſhall

* The female apologiſt juſtly obſerves, that in this "deſcription of the Slave-trade I give but the leaſt half of the truth." As the object of my writing was not to deſcribe the minutiæ of the trade, I recommend to the peruſal of thoſe who wiſh for full information, the Abſtract of the evidence on this ſubject, ſold by Phillips in George Yard, London ſtreet, or even the Extracts from the Evidence, price 4d. publiſhed by Wayland, Middle-row.

quietly

quietly go to ſleep, till the lordly Creole himſelf ſhall deign to proclaim "liberty to the captive," is one of thoſe pleaſing reveries I cannot adviſe you to indulge. As Britons, we are jealous leſt the chains which are forged for Africans, at the extremities of the empire, ſhould be rivetted on our necks at its centre. As men, who feel the indignity offered to our ſpecies, by the continuance of the ſlave trade *in the very teeth of evidence*, we ſhould be aſhamed to accept a paltry junket as a ſuccedaneum for that juſtice which we demand for the whole human race. As Chriſtians, we conceive there is ſuch a thing as moral principle, and that the Holy Scriptures, taken in their obvious, natural ſenſe, are to be the rule of our conduct. We find it an univerſal maxim of the New Teſtament, that Chriſtians ought to have "no fellowſhip with the unfruitful works of darkneſs, but rather to reprove them." We conceive, that ſuch actions as are contrary to the ſpirit of the goſpel, *are* works of darkneſs. We think that detaining juſt men in ſlavery, is contrary to the ſpirit of the goſpel*. Therefore, we

* Although there is no direct prohibition of this practice, yet it is included in the moral precept of loving our neighbour as ourſelves. To ſay that the Apoſtle Paul "never mentioned the *purchaſing* of ſlaves as a ſin," is talking nonſenſe; becauſe he never mentioned it at all. The *dealing* in ſlaves is mentioned but once in the New Teſtament; and then it is recorded as the practice of a city whoſe ſins have reached unto heaven, and over whoſe downfall the Apoſtles and Prophets of God are called to rejoice. It is readily admitted that the ſervants to whom Paul wrote, were not in poſſeſſion of full perſonal liberty. Nor were the peaſants of France before the revolution. But to have called them ſlaves, would never have been admitted, except as a figurative expreſſion. With reſpect to the hiſtory of Oneſimus, my opponent is entirely wrong, Paul never delivered him up to Philemon as his legal property. As a Jew he could not do ſo, without revolting againſt the legiſlative authority of the Almighty which forbid any ſuch tranſaction; and, as a Chriſtian, he had received no diſpenſation to violate the laws of hoſpitality. He ſent him, "not as a ſervant, (not under a guard as a runaway negroe,) but as a voluntary meſſenger, bearing the news of his own converſion, and of the willingneſs of Paul to repay what he owed to his maſter, at the ſame time, the confidence which Paul repoſed in Philemon was ſo great, that he was perſuaded that he would not only receive Oneſimus with the common welcome of a gueſt, but even ſeek and embrace an opportunity of extending his friendſhip to him ſtill farther. Had Paul acted in any other manner, he would have proved that he was not under the influence of that religion, whoſe avowed object was, to promote "Peace on

We ought to reprove it: and this we do not to the utmoſt of our power, unleſs we refrain from it ourſelves—reprimand it in others—avoid any act which we think may induce another to purſue it—reject the pleaſures and profits which immediately acrue from it—and uſe every lawful means to prevent it.

By way of extreme unction to your expiring cauſe, you ſuggeſt the idea, that our combination looks very much like perſecution; that the planters will think themſelves perſecuted. What Guinea pirates or Weſt India planters may ſay or think, can be of very little importance to honeſt, diſintereſted men. "They have had their good things;" and the poor victims of their avarice, "their evil things." It is time *they* ſhould be comforted, even though their oppreſſors ſhould be tormented. When Mr. Palmer's plan for conveying the mail was firſt agitated, you did not call *that* doing evil, that good might come, (at leaſt not from the preſs.) You did not then urge, that many children were employed in driving, and many mechanics in conſtructing the wretched wheelbarrows, by which letters were then conveyed. You did not even think of the poor innkeepers, coach-maſters, and others, who had employed large capitals in travelling accommodations. Much leſs did you think of calling that tradeſman a perſecutor who refuſed to negociate a bill, or to purchaſe a caſket of diamonds, which had been ſtolen from a public conveyance. You never ſuggeſted the argument, that, "all the means and manner of carrying on buſineſs belonged to the man himſelf, and was what his cuſtomers had nothing to do with." Why, then, is our abſtinence from the produce of ſlavery called perſecution? * Is it leſs a crime

on earth, and good-will to men." Becauſe experience evinces that unconditional ſlavery is the parent of anarchy, the nurſe of every vice, and the bane of every virtue; that it was never foſtered but to gratify the vileſt paſſions of the heart; nor has it ever found an advocate in any *honeſt* man.

* This abſtinence is now called, "trampling under foot and ſtarving our countrymen." But, as Chriſtians, it is our duty to attend to the tears of the oppreſſed without any regard to local ſituation; eſpecially when, "on the ſide of their oppreſſors, there is power." And if it be admitted that, in rectifying abuſes, the welfare of the *majority* ought to be attended to, it ſhould be recollected that the number of ſlaves is conſiderably larger than that of their tyrants,

aſſet

crime to rob a man of liberty than of property? or, are the generality of perſons concerned in the ſlave trade, more honourable characters than the generality of highwaymen?

I ſhall conclude this letter by confirming, as far as the influence of my word extends, the general tenor of the evidence laid before the Houſe of Commons on colonial ſlavery. I know one of the perſons, who is mentioned to have committed ſome acts of atrocity; and, from her general character, I ſhould conceive them true. I have myſelf ſeen a negro whipt, at the mandate of a drunken tyrant, till he could not ſit down, ignorant of the crime of which he was accuſed, and which, it afterwards turned out, he had not committed. I have ſeen a white woman ſuperintend the puniſhment of one of her own ſex, provided with a horſe-whip, for the purpoſe of beating the negro whipper when he did not ſtrike hard enough. I have been waited upon, at the houſe of a lady in Antigua, by a female ſlave in a ſtate of nature. I have heard an overſeer declare, that the beſt mode of ſeaſoning a negro, is to give him nine-and-thirty laſhes ſoon after he comes upon an eſtate, to make him know where he is. I have heard the ſame wretch boaſt, that once he vexed his driver, by compelling him to flog the female with whom he cohabited. I have ſeen, in moſt of our iſlands, crowds of negroes, half naked, and apparently half ſtarved, generally diſfigured by the cart-whip, and not unfrequently in chains. I have ſeen, with indignation, the little pittance of their Sunday's labour wreſted from their hands by the indigent whites; and only ſuch a price paid for it as the purchaſer thought proper to affix. I have known many inſtances of their being ſent from one iſland to another, merely for the convenience of their maſters. I have, on theſe occaſions, ſeen the deareſt relatives realize the agonies of deſpair, from a conſciouſneſs that they were to meet no more. I have ſeen them lingering in a dungeon for the inſolvency of their maſters. I have known a miſerable, deſerted

a ſet of men with whom every attribute of Deity is at variance, who ſeem to exiſt only for the chaſtiſement of mankind, and who muſt be very cautious how they talk of charity and juſtice, as perhaps it may appear that both theſe virtues require a more awful ſacrifice than what they impudently term their property.

Lazarus

Lazarus inſulted by his owner, only for aſking for a morſel of bread.

I do not mean to deny, that I have known negroes contented and happy. When their kind fate places them as domeſtics under the roof of a humane maſter, it is often the caſe. Theſe ſolitary inſtances are made the moſt of by the advocates for ſlavery. But when I recollect the ſeverity I have ſeen practiſed by men of the greateſt humanity, in paroxyſms of rage or intoxication - when I reflect, that, in caſe of inſolvency, a ſlave may lie for weeks in a dungeon, and afterwards take his chance for a good maſter at a public auction—I cannot conceive that a few exceptions prove any thing againſt the general miſery of colonial ſlavery. For offences not cognizable by individuals, the code of laws for the puniſhment of ſlaves proves more effectually than a thouſand arguments, that the Weſt Indians are a ſanguinary, brutal, vindictive race. For ſtriking a white man, the hand of a ſlave is cut off. For inſurrection, almoſt all our iſlands abound with inſtances of their being, *gibbeted, and even roaſted alive* *. In Chriſtmas, 1781, at Antigua, two ſlaves killed a ſcoundrel who had deprived them of their holidays, and otherwiſe ill-treated them. The hand of the principal was chopped off, before he was put to death. If ever ſuch ſavage inhumanity was neceſſary, it was inflicted with a very bad grace, in a country where white men had frequently been puniſhed with impriſonment and a ſmall fine, for the murder of negroes. In vain do we hope for individual reformation in the Weſt Indies. It is not to be expected in a country where an exertion of law is an exertion of brutality. Nor ſhould it excite our ſurpriſe, when we behold that latent ſpark of liberty which had been ſtifled,

* Againſt this liſt is to be placed as a *ſet-off*, maſters beating their apprentices, and men murdering their wives. I am alſo triumphantly asked, if the good people of England are to oppoſe apprenticing of youth, or to diſannul the order of nature by forbidding marriage? Brilliant as this flouriſh appears, it is unfortunately not original. An Orator, in the Houſe of Commons, ſtated, that an haberdaſher once killed her apprentice, then asked, muſt we therefore aboliſh haberdaſhery? Was this *Wiſeacre* objecting to a bill for the abolition of planting?

but

but not extinguiſhed, burſt into a devouring flame, and prompt an injured race to break their chains promiſcuouſly upon the heads of the innocent and the guilty. If we would radically cure theſe evils, let us teach governments humanity. Let us recover *our* dignity, and Africans will recover *their* liberty. Let us looſe ſight of the intereſt of *tyrants*, and *not* continue to be cannibals from motives of compaſſion. Let our united efforts beſpeak the ſincerity of our ſouls, and let us hail the ſoft effulgence of that dawn of liberty, which in deſpite of hell, ſhall riſe to meridian ſplendour, and, with undiminiſhed blaze, diſpenſe its genial influence from pole to pole, till time ſhall be more.

I am,

Madam,

Yours, &c.

RICHARD HILLIER.

Surry,
November 14th, 1791.

*** The flattering reception which the firſt edition of this letter met with, has induced its author to make a few remarks on the ſecond lucubration of the female apologiſt for ſlavery. For though it contains nothing of a reply but the *name*, it might, from the mere circumſtance of its being called a reply, have induced the friends of ſlavery to imagine that their cauſe had at laſt found a victorious champion. Deſperate as their ſituation is, they will not deſpiſe any auxiliary, however weak. Unfortunately, however, ſlavery is not ſo amiable as to call up a ſingle advocate who will defend it for its own ſake. Nor has iniquity ſo far conquered ſhame as to induce a ſingle ſlave-holder to pledge his veracity for the probability of half the abſurdities which have been urged in defence of colonial ſlavery. Hence we find all the advocates of the ſlave-trade are intereſted men and anonymous writers. Some of the latter have been traced to their lurking-holes and dragged

to public odium. Although it is in my power to point out the perſon to whom this letter is addreſſed, tenderneſs for the weakneſs of human nature, and a regard for the honor of the fair ſex, induce me to avoid the ſacrifice of any victim which the cauſe of liberty does not require. Suffice it to ſay, that my opponent conceives herſelf deeply *intereſted* in this matter, as ſhe lives by retailing a commodity which, in her apprehenſion, the torrent of "misguided zeal" may one day ſweep away. For the repoſe of her mind, however, I adviſe her to read the acts of the firſt Aſſembly of Virginia, after the declaration of American independence.

FINIS.